

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following comments is respectfully requested. Claims 77-158 are pending, Claims 77, 117, 119 and 153 having been amended by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 77-84, 87-93, 103-112, 116-125, 127, 129-130, 136 and 153-158 were rejected as being unpatentable over Shildneck (U.S. Patent No. 3,014,139) in view of Elton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,853,565, hereinafter Elton) and further in view of Wood (UK 1,135,242); Claims 85 and 86 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Shildneck in view of Elton and Wood and in further view of Mazzorana (French Patent 2,594,271 and 2,556,146); Claims 94-102, 126, 128, 131-135, 137-144 and 148-152 were rejected as being unpatentable over Shildneck in view of Elton and Wood and in further view of Grant (U.S. Patent No. 5,325,008); Claims 113-115 were rejected as being unpatentable over Shildneck in view of Elton and Wood and in further view of Siemens (German Patent 468,827); and Claims 145-147 were rejected as being unpatentable over Shildneck in view of Elton and Wood and in further view of Madsen (U.S. Patent No. 3,932,779).

In reply, each of the independent claims has been amended to clarify that the second semiconductor conducting layer is arranged to surround and be in contact with the solid insulation layer, and the second semiconductor layer being formed from an extruded material. The extruded material is configured to protect the stator winding from being damaged when the stator winding is drawn through the first slot, second slot and third slot.

Support for this amendment is found at least at page 10, lines 29-35, and therefore no new matter is added.

Comparing Claim 77 to the rejection, the rejection is based on the substitution of the cable in Elton for that used in Shildneck. Moreover, the rejection is based on Elton's cable

being sufficiently flexible because the semiconducting layer can be "molded", or "blown" onto a cable without causing cable rigidity. However, Claim 77, as well as the other independent claims have been amended to clarify that the outer semiconductor layer is applied through extrusion (not molded or blown). Because the material is extruded, it is possible (as recognized by the present inventors) to draw the cable (with all of its components thereon) through the stator slots while preserving the mechanical integrity of the winding. Such would not be the case with the device in Elton, where the outer semi-conducting material is apparently "molded" or "blown" onto the cable. As such, the cable in Elton would not have the advantages of having an outer semiconductor layer be formed through an extrusion process, that would allow it to advantageously, be drawn through slots in a stator without being damaged.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that no matter how Shildneck, Elton and Wood are combined, the combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent Claims 77, 117, 119, and 153. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that these independent claims patentably define over the asserted prior art. For substantially the same reasons as discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims rejected over the combination of Shildneck in view of Elton and Wood, also patentably define over the asserted prior art.

Claims 85 and 86 are rejected over Shildneck, Elton and Wood in further view of Mazzorana, which is asserted for forming different types of slot shapes. However, no matter how Mazzorana is combined with Shildneck, Elton and Wood, the combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of Claim 77 and therefore does not render obvious the invention of Claims 85 and 86.

Similarly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 94-102, 126, 128, 131-135, 137-144 and 148-152, patentably define over Shildneck in view of Elton, Wood and Grant. Grant is

asserted for its use of a constraint ripple spring assembly. However, even if Grant does disclose this feature, the combination of Grant in view of the other asserted references, do not teach or suggest all the inventions of the independent claims, and therefore do not render obvious Claims 94-102, 126, 128, 131-135, 137-144 and 148-152.

Similarly, Claims 145-147 are rejected based on the above asserted prior art in view of Madsen. Madsen is asserted for its use of a rotor winding including a plurality of slots, wedges and thin pressure tubes. However, this disclosure in Madsen does not cure the deficiencies with regard to Shildneck, Elton, and Wood. Therefore, no matter how Madsen is combined with Shildneck, Elton and Wood the combination does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claim from which Claims 145-147 depend, namely Claim 119.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 77-158, as amended, is patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
BDL:smi  
I:\ATTY\BDL\9847\98470001-AM.DOC